

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6, 7 and 12 have been amended. Proper support for the amendment of claims 1 and 7 is found in the specification, at least, at paragraph [0028]. Proper support for the amendment of claims 6 and 12 is found in the specification, at least, at paragraph [0036] and in Fig. 6. Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-12 are pending and under consideration. Claims 1, 6, 7 and 12 are the independent claims. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW:

On March 24, 2009 an interview was conducted between Examiners Kim and Jackson and Applicant's Representative Mr. Rodriguez. During the interview claims 1, 6, 7 and 12 were discussed, as well as several proposed amendments that would further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. No agreement was reached.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS:

Claims 1 and 7 are objected to because of a minor informality.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 7 in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claims 1 and 7 be withdrawn.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Claims 1, 3-5, 7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Oka et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,184,541).

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it is noted that claim 1, as amended, recites a thin film transistor (TFT) comprising an offset region having no doping and a plurality of primary crystal grain boundaries, wherein the thin film transistor is formed so that the primary crystal grain boundaries of a polysilicon substrate are not positioned in the offset region, and wherein a width of the offset region, included in an activation layer, is smaller than a distance between the primary crystal grain boundaries.

The Office Action relies on Oka for a teaching of some of the features of claim 1 and states that Oka discloses a lightly doped drain LDD region, wherein primary crystal grain boundaries are not positioned in the LDD region. The Office Action further states that the LDD region is a portion of region 4 included in width "d," and that the width "d" could also be considered "an offset region."

Applicants respectfully traverse such assertions for at least the following reasons. Oka discloses a film 3 having a grain boundary 2 formed on an insulating substrate 1 and a source 6 and a drain 7 each of them having an LDD structure that has a low concentration region 4 and a high concentration region 5. The low concentration region 4 has a low impurity concentration and the high concentration region 5 has a high impurity concentration (column 3, lines 36-43). Oka further discloses that the low concentration region has a length "D" and an effective length "d." Therefore, although the portion "d" of the low concentration region appears not to have any crystal grain boundaries therein, it is noted that portion "d" of the low concentration region is part of the LDD region and is thus doped.

Contrary to Oka, independent claim 1 recites a thin film transistor (TFT) comprising an offset region having no doping. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) should be withdrawn because Oka fails to teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully note that region "d" is not an LDD region as noted in the Office Action, but is rather part of the LDD region "D." Therefore, the LDD region is "D" and not "d" (see column 3, lines 36-50), as suggested in the Office Action. Therefore, the primary crystal grain boundary 2 is positioned in the LDD region since the distance between the primary crystal grain boundaries is smaller than D (see Fig. 1(b)).

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 7, it is noted that this claim recites some substantially similar features as claim 1. Thus, the rejection of this claim is also traversed for substantially the same reasons set forth above.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 3-5 and 9-11 are allowable at least because of their dependency from claims 1 and 7, and because they include additional features which are not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 3-5 and 9-11 also distinguish over the prior art.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

Claims 6 and 12 are allowed.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN MCEWEN, LLP

Date: 4/14/09

By: 
Douglas X. Rodriguez
Registration No. 47,269

1400 Eye St., N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510